

EBI 2005 Survey of Washington-trained new teachers (2003-2004 cohort of program completers)*

Background

The State Board of Education requires educator preparation programs to solicit feedback from program completers and their supervisors.[WAC 180-78A-255] While many programs conduct their own follow-ups, all of the teacher preparation programs in the state also participate in a survey of first-year teachers and their principals.

The survey is conducted on behalf of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction by Educational Benchmarking, Incorporated (EBI), and is administered electronically to first-year teachers in Washington public schools, as well as to their principals. The survey contains 28 questions based on Washington's teacher standards. For each item, teachers are asked to indicate the degree to which their preparation programs helped them meet the standard, on a scale from 1 ("not at all") to 7 ("extremely"). Four additional questions gauge teachers' overall satisfaction with their preparation. Principals of first-year teachers are asked to indicate the degree to which the teacher has demonstrated the standards, again using a scale from 1-7.

*The survey was administered in spring of 2005 to Washington public school teachers who were in their first year of teaching. The responses were further screened to include only those teachers who completed their preparation programs with the 2003-04 cohort.

Results of 2005 teacher alumni survey

Factor scores. The 32 items on the survey are clustered into five related factors:

- Develop instructional strategies
- Develop reading strategies
- Develop student learning
- Manage learning context and environment
- Overall effectiveness of program

Overall, factor scores for the 2005 survey were modestly changed from the 2004 survey. One factor ("Develop student learning") showed a statistically significant gain ($p < .001$); three factors showed gains that were not statistically significant, and one factor ("Overall program effectiveness") showed a slight decline that was not statistically significant. These results mirror the pattern established in previously years. Thus, the year-to-year gains are small, but the long-term trend is upward.

Table 1

| Teacher Alumni Survey | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Factor | 2000-01 cohort | 2001-02 cohort | 2002-03 cohort | 2003-04 cohort |
| 1. Develop instructional strategies | 5.14 | 5.32 | 5.35 | 5.44 |
| 2. Develop reading skills strategies | 4.30 | 4.51 | 4.62 | 4.67 |
| 3. Develop student learning | 5.09 | 5.26 | 5.33 | 5.51 |
| 4. Manage learning context and environment | 5.20 | 5.32 | 5.35 | 5.54 |
| 5. Overall program effectiveness | 4.91 | 5.15 | 5.21 | 5.17 |

*Results are based on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 through 7, in which 1=not at all, 4=moderately, and 7=extremely (2,3,5, and 6 are not given a verbal label). Responses to individual items on this year's survey ranged from a low of 4.24 to a high of 6.00.

Individual items. Mean ratings for fifteen questions fell into a range (5.5—6.5) that EBI characterizes as “excellent:”

- incorporate EALRs into instruction (6.00)
- set up environments that promote collaborative student learning (5.81)
- use variety of strategies to reflect on the effectiveness of instruction and make modifications when needed (5.80)
- create learning experiences that make subject matter meaningful to students (5.77)
- develop developmentally appropriate learning activities that engage students in learning (5.72)
- use reflective analysis to assess “positive impact on student learning” (5.67)
- collaborate with colleagues to support student learning (5.67)
- articulate learning targets for student learning (5.66)
- facilitate opportunities for students to participate in decision-making (5.59)
- use assessment information to inform the design of instruction (5.58)
- develop culturally relevant learning opportunities for all students (5.58)
- use a variety of methods to regularly gather information on student progress (5.58)
- manage the classroom to support student learning (5.58)
- use a variety of instructional strategies to address all levels of academic abilities and talents (5.57)
- use communication strategies to create supportive interactions in the classroom (5.56)

These fifteen questions constitute 54% of the instruction-related items on the survey; last year, only six items fell within this range.

Conversely, mean ratings for two questions fell into a range (3.50-4.50) that EBI characterizes as “fair:”

- use current research-based intervention strategies to prevent reading difficulties (4.24)
- (use current research-based intervention strategies to diagnose reading difficulties (4.33)

These two items also fell within this range on previous surveys.

Mean ratings for all other questions were characterized by EBI as “good” (4.50-5.50). (See Table 5 for complete results).

Demographic influences. EBI breaks out factor means demographically, including gender, age, ethnicity, program type (undergraduate vs. master’s or post-baccalaureate), GPA, primary endorsement area, primary teaching (assignment) area, and length of student teaching. This year’s survey found several areas in which there was a statistically significant difference:

- Teachers who completed a postbaccalaureate program gave their programs higher marks in two areas compared to teachers who completed a Bachelor’s degree program: Factor 1 (“develop instructional strategies”) and Factor 3 (“develop student learning”); these differences were modestly significant ($p < .05$).
- Teachers who had longer student teaching experiences (one semester or more) rated their programs higher than teachers whose student teaching was one quarter or less on Factor 1 and Factor 3; the difference was somewhat significant ($p < .01$).
- Teachers from ethnic minorities gave higher ratings on Factor 1 than did white teachers, though the difference was only modestly significant ($p < .05$).
- Teachers with a higher grade-point average (3.75 or higher) gave modestly higher ratings on Factor 1 than did teachers with GPAs below 3.75 ($p < .05$).

In general, past surveys have shown few demographic differences. The one exception has been in Factor 2 (“develop reading skills strategies”), where teachers prepared to teach early childhood or elementary grades have consistently given higher ratings than teachers in other areas (secondary, middle, special, and vocational). That difference was again present this year ($p < .001$). (For further discussion, see the analysis of reading items later in this report).

As noted above, teachers in ethnic minorities gave their programs a higher rating on Factor 1 than did white teachers. Although that was the only statistically significant difference, it is worth noting that over the past four years minority candidates (with the exception of Native American teachers) have tended to rate their program’s effectiveness more highly than have whites. Because the number of teachers in each category can be very small, the differences should be viewed with caution, but the consistency over time is striking.

Table 2

| Ethnicity | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 |
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Multiracial | | | | | |
| 2000-01 | 5.29 | 4.20 | 5.31 | 5.50 | 4.94 |
| 2001-02 | 5.25 | 4.43 | 5.15 | 5.27 | 5.21 |
| 2002-03 | 5.33 | 5.02 | 5.35 | 5.67 | 5.39 |
| 2003-04 | 5.71 | 4.59 | 5.66 | 5.62 | 5.18 |
| African-American | | | | | |
| 2000-01 | 5.75 | 5.04 | 5.87 | 5.67 | 5.31 |
| 2001-02 | 5.50 | 5.00 | 5.75 | 5.71 | 5.45 |
| 2002-03 | 6.21 | 5.56 | 6.02 | 6.06 | 5.86 |
| 2003-04 | 6.85 | 6.78 | 6.86 | 6.81 | 6.92 |
| Native American | | | | | |
| 2000-01 | 5.20 | 4.33 | 5.12 | 5.04 | 4.96 |
| 2001-02 | 5.56 | 4.55 | 5.24 | 5.37 | 5.25 |
| 2002-03 | 5.39 | 4.67 | 5.07 | 5.06 | 4.38 |
| 2003-04 | 5.04 | 4.14 | 5.06 | 5.04 | 4.31 |
| Asian American | | | | | |
| 2000-01 | 5.29 | 4.37 | 5.07 | 5.32 | 5.19 |
| 2001-02 | 5.45 | 4.86 | 5.64 | 5.51 | 5.36 |
| 2002-03 | 5.57 | 5.24 | 5.45 | 5.40 | 5.86 |
| 2003-04 | 5.62 | 5.04 | 5.64 | 5.60 | 5.26 |
| Hispanic American | | | | | |
| 2000-01 | 5.42 | 4.98 | 5.52 | 5.75 | 5.49 |
| 2001-02 | 5.56 | 5.00 | 5.33 | 5.48 | 5.69 |
| 2002-03 | 5.05 | 4.33 | 4.99 | 4.99 | 4.95 |
| 2003-04 | 5.72 | 5.29 | 5.83 | 5.80 | 5.45 |
| White American | | | | | |
| 2000-01 | 5.12 | 4.28 | 5.06 | 5.17 | 4.88 |
| 2001-02 | 5.32 | 4.49 | 5.25 | 5.32 | 5.13 |
| 2002-03 | 5.35 | 4.58 | 5.33 | 5.34 | 5.19 |
| 2003-04 | 5.40 | 4.63 | 5.46 | 5.50 | 5.16 |

Factor 1: Develop instructional strategies; Factor 2: Develop reading skills strategies; Factor 3: Develop student learning; Factor 4: Manage learning context and environment; Factor 5: Overall satisfaction with program

Note: Ethnic identity is self-reported.

Results of principal survey

Related surveys are e-mailed to principals of respondents on the teacher alumni survey. Principals are asked to rate the degree to which the new teacher demonstrate various skills, using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 through 7, in which 1=not at all, 4=moderately, and 7=extremely (2,3,5, and 6 are not given a verbal label). Responses to individual items on this year's survey ranged from a low of 4.76 to a high of 6.07.

Factor scores. As with the teacher survey, responses to individual questions are grouped into five factors. This year's results were also similar to the teacher survey in that four of the factors were up slightly, while overall program satisfaction was down slightly. However, none of the differences were statistically significant.

The four-year trend shows somewhat more fluctuation than the teacher survey, although all factors for the 2003-04 cohort were higher than in the first year the survey was administered. As in the past, principals tended to rate teachers' preparation more highly than did the teachers themselves. However, this was the first year in which a factor score ("Developing student learning") was higher for teachers than for principals.

The comparative results for the past four years are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

| Principals' Survey | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Factor | Mean rating 2000-2001 cohort | Mean rating 2001-2002 cohort | Mean rating 2002-2003 cohort | Mean rating 2003-2004 cohort |
| 1. Develop instructional strategies | 5.24 | 5.48 | 5.41 | 5.45 |
| 2. Develop reading skills strategies | 4.73 | 5.13 | 4.91 | 5.03 |
| 3. Develop student learning | 5.23 | 5.45 | 5.38 | 5.44 |
| 4. Manage learning context and environment | 5.44 | 5.61 | 5.62 | 5.64 |
| 5. Overall satisfaction with preparation | 5.42 | 5.66 | 5.62 | 5.43 |

Individual items. Mean ratings on fourteen questions fell into the range (5.50-6.50) that EBI characterizes as "excellent," and all other ratings fell into the 4.50-5.50 range ("good").

Individual items receiving the highest ratings were:

- collaborate with colleagues to support student learning (6.07)
- set up environments that promote collaborative student learning (5.78)
- create learning experiences that make subject matter meaningful to students (5.77)
- manage the classroom to support student learning (5.77)
- use communication strategies to create supportive interactions in the classroom (5.76)
- incorporate EALRs into instruction (5.74)
- develop developmentally appropriate learning activities that engage students in learning (5.65)
- extent to which this teacher fulfills your expectations for teaching quality (5.64)
- use knowledge of subject matter to make curriculum decisions (5.64)
- use a variety of strategies to reflect on the effectiveness of instruction and make modifications when needed (5.63)
- use reflective analysis to assess positive impact on student learning (5.53)

- use assessment information to inform the design of instruction (5.52)
- use variety of methods to regularly gather information on student progress (5.52)
- articulate learning targets for student learning (5.51)

There was a high degree of congruence between principal and teacher alumni responses. Of the fifteen highest-rated items for alumni, twelve also appeared among the ten highest-rated areas for principals; likewise, seven items among the teachers' ten lowest-rated also appeared among the principals' ten lowest-rated items.

The principal survey also asks principals to compare particular teachers with other new teachers from Washington programs as well as from out-of-state. As in the past, principals indicated a high degree of satisfaction when comparing teachers to graduates of other programs:

Table 4

| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Comparing to teachers from in-state programs | | | | |
| The best prepared | 6% | 11% | 9% | 7% |
| Among best-prepared | 36% | 41% | 44% | 44% |
| Better prepared than most | 23% | 24% | 24% | 27% |
| About as well-prepared as others | 22% | 19% | 19% | 18% |
| Less well-prepared than most others | 7% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| Among the least well-prepared | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% |
| Least well-prepared | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Can't compare | 5% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| | | | | |
| Comparing to teachers from out-of-state programs | | | | |
| The best prepared | 7% | 10% | 10% | 8% |
| Among best-prepared | 29% | 35% | 34% | 35% |
| Better prepared than most | 18% | 21% | 20% | 19% |
| About as well-prepared as others | 16% | 15% | 16% | 14% |
| Less well-prepared than most others | 5% | 3% | 2% | 2% |
| Among the least well-prepared | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Least well-prepared | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Can't compare | 24% | 15% | 17% | 22% |
| | | | | |
| Quality of teacher performance | | | | |
| Top 91-100% of teachers | 38% | 39% | 36% | 39% |
| Top 81-90% of teachers | 26% | 30% | 33% | 34% |
| Middle 61-80% of teachers | 19% | 15% | 19% | 14% |
| Middle 41-60% of teachers | 10% | 8% | 9% | 6% |
| Middle 21-40% of teachers | 3% | 4% | 2% | 4% |
| Bottom 11-20% of teachers | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% |
| Bottom 10% of teachers | 2% | 3% | 1% | 1% |

Traditional programs compared to alternative route programs

As we did last year, we were interested in seeing whether there were any differences between those alternative route teachers and graduates of traditional programs.

Unfortunately, as was the case last year, the very small N for respondents from alternative route programs (22), makes any meaningful conclusions impossible. The data for the teacher alumni survey are presented here for informational purposes only.

| Teacher Alumni Survey | Traditional | | Alternate route | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 |
| Factor 1: Develop Instructional Strategies | 5.36 | 5.43 | 5.17 | 5.63 |
| | | | | |
| Factor 2: Develop Reading Skills Strategies | 4.67 | 4.66 | 3.81 | 4.98 |
| | | | | |
| Factor 3: Develop Student Learning | 5.33 | 5.50 | 5.29 | 5.95 |
| | | | | |
| Factor 4: Manage Learning Context and Environment | 5.37 | 5.52 | 5.06 | 5.84 |
| | | | | |
| Factor 5: Overall satisfaction with preparation | 5.22 | 5.16 | 4.98 | 5.46 |

Analysis

As with any survey of perceptions, caution should be used in drawing conclusions. However, the following comments seem warranted by the results.

1. While it's difficult to put a qualitative rating on the overall results, teacher perceptions of their preparation are clearly in the positive range. Moreover, the accuracy of those perceptions is further validated by the views of principals, whose perceptions largely mirrored those of the teachers themselves. Another indicator is the small number of teachers who felt severely ill-prepared. On most items, the combined total of the lowest ratings (1s and 2s) was in the 2-3% range; in only two cases (both dealing with reading) did the total rise into double digits (17-18%). The same pattern was apparent in principals' responses (9-10% on the two reading items).

2. Within the overall positive picture, there remain areas of concern, most notably the items related to use of intervention strategies to diagnose and prevent reading difficulties (see analysis below). In addition, as on previous surveys, use of technology received a relatively low mean rating (4.95), as did use of instructional strategies for developing writing skills (4.90).

More broadly, the highest-rated items tended to be the core skills of everyday classroom instruction (using a variety of strategies, setting up environments that promote collaborative learning, incorporating EALRs into instruction, creating learning experiences that make subject matter meaningful to students, using assessment information, etc.). The lower-rated items tended to involve more specialized skills or individual student needs (working with reading difficulties, incorporating technology, developing learning opportunities for students with disabilities, actively engaging

parents, etc.). This pattern may just reflect normal developmental learning processes—novices typically master basic or routine skills before becoming comfortable with non-routine or exceptional circumstances. In addition, many of the lower-rated skills may be inherently difficult to master, even for experienced teachers.

3. As has been the case in past surveys, principals generally rated first-year teachers higher than did the teachers themselves (although not to the same degree as in past surveys). It should be noted that the two surveys are not strictly comparable. Teachers are explicitly asked to rate how well their preparation programs prepared them in various skill areas; principals are asked to rate these teachers' actual performance. It's at least possible that teachers view their actual performance as highly as do the principals, but are not willing to attribute all of their skill to their preparation program. Alternatively, it may be that new teachers approach their first year with more idealistic expectations of what they should achieve, whereas principals have a fuller appreciation of the complexity of teaching.

4. Finally, the number of responses on this year's teacher survey was 634, which is an increase of just over 100 from the previous year. However, we continue to face challenges in identifying and reaching the target population (first-year teachers in Washington public schools who completed Washington preparation programs). Our best estimate at this time is that we received responses from 40-50% of the target group. This is a large enough sample to give us a good snapshot of the statewide picture, but it does not always yield meaningful data at the individual program level. The Professional Education and Certification office will continue to seek ways to improve the response rate on the 2006 survey.

Analysis of Response to Reading Questions

In the past, respondents to the EBI survey have identified the prevention and diagnosis of reading difficulties as the areas in which they felt least prepared. Because of this, and because of the heightened federal emphasis on reading instruction, it's worth taking an especially close look at what the data show.

EBI actually clusters three questions as a “reading factor.” Teachers are asked the following:

Q8. Rate the degree to which the teacher preparation program developed the skill/ability to use instructional strategies for developing reading skills

Q14. Rate the degree to which the teacher preparation program developed the skill/ability to use current research-based intervention strategies to diagnose reading difficulties

Q15. Rate the degree to which the teacher preparation program developed the skill/ability to use current research-based intervention strategies to prevent reading difficulties

Percent of responses in each category were as follows (where 7=extremely, 4=moderately, and 1=not at all).

| Ability | Cohort | Mean rating | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| use instructional strategies for developing reading skills | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2000-01 | 4.98 | 17 | 27 | 22 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 2 |
| | 2001-02 | 5.22 | 21 | 28 | 22 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| | 2002-03 | 5.30 | 23 | 27 | 24 | 14 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| | 2003-04 | 5.37 | 24 | 30 | 21 | 14 | 6 | 4 | 1 |
| use current research-based intervention strategies to diagnose reading difficulties | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2000-01 | 4.07 | 10 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 12 | 10 |
| | 2001-02 | 4.25 | 9 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 8 |
| | 2002-03 | 4.35 | 13 | 17 | 20 | 17 | 17 | 9 | 8 |
| | 2003-04 | 4.33 | 13 | 15 | 22 | 18 | 16 | 9 | 8 |
| use current research-based intervention strategies to prevent reading difficulties | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2000-01 | 3.75 | 7 | 10 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 14 | 12 |
| | 2001-02 | 4.01 | 7 | 14 | 18 | 23 | 18 | 11 | 9 |
| | 2002-03 | 4.12 | 10 | 14 | 16 | 22 | 19 | 11 | 7 |
| | 2003-04 | 4.24 | 10 | 16 | 22 | 17 | 17 | 10 | 8 |

Principals are asked the following questions:

Q8. Rate the degree to which the teacher demonstrates the skill/ability to use instructional strategies for developing reading skills

Q14. Rate the degree to which the teacher demonstrates the skill/ability to use current research-based intervention strategies to diagnose reading difficulties

Q15. Rate the degree to which the teacher demonstrates the skill/ability to use current research-based intervention strategies to prevent reading difficulties

Percent of responses in each category were as follows (where 7=extremely, 4=moderately, and 1=not at all).

| Ability | Cohort | Mean rating | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|
| use instructional strategies for reading | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2000-01 | 5.17 | 14 | 32 | 26 | 19 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| | 2001-02 | 5.47 | 21 | 28 | 22 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| | 2002-03 | 5.39 | 15 | 37 | 27 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| | 2003-04 | 5.43 | 19 | 38 | 23 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| use current research-based intervention strategies to diagnose reading difficulties | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2000-01 | 4.59 | 9 | 20 | 28 | 21 | 14 | 5 | 4 |
| | 2001-02 | 4.92 | 13 | 24 | 27 | 21 | 9 | 4 | 2 |
| | 2002-03 | 4.67 | 8 | 21 | 29 | 23 | 11 | 5 | 3 |
| | 2003-04 | 4.86 | 15 | 23 | 26 | 18 | 8 | 7 | 3 |
| use current research-based intervention strategies to prevent reading difficulties | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2000-01 | 4.43 | 6 | 17 | 31 | 22 | 16 | 6 | 4 |
| | 2001-02 | 4.92 | 13 | 24 | 28 | 18 | 11 | 4 | 2 |
| | 2002-03 | 4.55 | 16 | 19 | 31 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 3 |
| | 2003-04 | 4.76 | 9 | 25 | 30 | 15 | 12 | 6 | 3 |

Analysis

While the natural limitations of the survey preclude definitive interpretations, the results allow several conclusions and reasonable speculations.

1. As has been true on past surveys, the ratings for diagnosis and prevention of reading difficulties have lagged all other items on the survey, for both alumni and principals. It seems reasonable to conclude that whatever the reasons, the survey is measuring a real difference.

2. The pattern in these three questions mirrors the pattern found in other survey items: alumni feel better-prepared for everyday “regular” instruction than for handling exceptional or difficult cases. This shouldn’t be a surprising finding among beginning

teachers (and we might also speculate that even experienced teachers would find diagnosis and prevention more challenging than everyday reading instruction).

3. Additional insight comes from looking at responses in different endorsement areas. Although the small numbers of individuals in some endorsements dictate caution in interpreting results, there is a clear pattern. The highest ratings on factor 2 were given by teachers holding endorsements in Reading (5.56), Special Education (5.38), and Elementary Education (4.94). That contrasts with the means for science (4.17), biology (3.56) history (3.58), and mathematics (4.28). (A similar pattern was found in previous years.) When EBI compared the combined means for early childhood and elementary education (4.96) with the combined means for middle, secondary, special and vocational education (4.42), it found the difference to be statistically significant ($p < .001$).

These figures are hardly surprising, since the teaching areas with higher means typically receive the most coverage of instruction/assessment for reading. The unanswered question is whether the greater success of these areas is due just to more time spent on reading issues, or whether the strategies provided are in some way more effective than the strategies provided for teachers in other teaching areas.

4. EBI reports that some 6% of respondents failed to answer these two questions (compared to 2-3% on most other items), which suggests there may be some confusion around the term “research-based.” (However, this is lower than last year’s non-response rate of 9% on these questions.) Interestingly, some 10-11% of principals also failed to respond to these two questions (also down from last year’s 16-19%).

Whatever the explanation, the importance of this issue merits continuing research and discussion. As it has done in recent years, the Professional Education and Certification office has worked with colleges and universities to keep a focus on this question, and will continue to do so in the coming year. In particular, we will:

- a. Share the results of the survey at the OSPI/Higher Education Literacy meeting scheduled for November 30, 2005. This meeting will bring together OSPI personnel and higher education faculty responsible for literacy and special education.
- b. Conduct focus groups with recently prepared teachers to gain better insight into their perceptions of their preparation in this area and how that preparation could be improved.

EBI Teacher Alumni Survey Four-year Aggregate Results

Questions 1-28 are prefaced with the phrase, “Rate the degree to which the teacher preparation program developed the skill/ability to:”

Note: The survey is sent to public school teachers in Washington. Teachers prepared outside the state are not included. Surveys in 2003 and 2004 were completed only by the most recent cohort of program completers (i.e., people who completed their program in the previous academic-year).

| | Cohort | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 |
| Factor 1: Develop Instructional Strategies | 5.23 | 5.32 | 5.35 | 5.44 |
| Q1. Incorporate EALRs (essential academic learning requirements) into instruction | 5.92 | 5.88 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| Q2. Use assessment information to inform the design of instruction | 5.33 | 5.52 | 5.51 | 5.58 |
| Q3. Use a variety of strategies to reflect on the instruction effectiveness/necessary modifications | 5.61 | 5.68 | 5.76 | 5.80 |
| Q4. Use technology to enhance students' learning | 4.50 | 4.79 | 4.88 | 4.95 |
| Q5. Use knowledge of subject matter to make curriculum decisions | 5.25 | 5.26 | 5.29 | 5.40 |
| Q6. Articulate learning targets for student learning | 5.42 | 5.48 | 5.47 | 5.66 |
| Q7. Use instructional strategies for developing writing skills | 4.82 | 4.92 | 4.90 | 4.90 |
| Q9. Implement effective instructional strategies related to critical thinking | 5.13 | 5.25 | 5.20 | 5.38 |
| Q10. Implement effective instructional strategies related to problem solving. | 5.10 | 5.15 | 5.12 | 5.26 |
| | | | | |
| Factor 2: Develop Reading Skills Strategies | 4.42 | 4.51 | 4.62 | 4.67 |
| Q8. Use instructional strategies for developing reading skills | 5.17 | 5.22 | 5.30 | 5.37 |
| Q 14. Use current research-based intervention strategies to diagnose reading difficulties | 4.15 | 4.25 | 4.35 | 4.33 |
| Q15. Use current research-based intervention strategies to prevent reading difficulties | 3.87 | 4.01 | 4.12 | 4.24 |
| | | | | |
| Factor 3: Develop Student Learning | 5.18 | 5.26 | 5.33 | 5.51 |
| Q11. Use a variety of instructional strategies to address all levels of academic abilities and talents | 5.38 | 5.43 | 5.43 | 5.57 |
| Q12. Develop developmentally appropriate learning activities that engage students in learning | 5.50 | 5.53 | 5.50 | 5.72 |
| Q13. Develop appropriate learning opportunities for students with disabilities | 4.91 | 4.93 | 4.88 | 5.10 |
| Q16. Develop culturally relevant learning opportunities for all students | 5.22 | 5.21 | 5.38 | 5.58 |
| Q17. Use reflective analysis to assess “positive impact on student learning” | 5.16 | 5.36 | 5.45 | 5.67 |

| | Cohort | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 |
| Q18. Document “positive impact on learning.” | 4.77 | 4.97 | 5.14 | 5.32 |
| Q19. Use a variety of methods to regularly gather information on student progress | 5.34 | 5.39 | 5.40 | 5.58 |
| Factor 4: Manage Learning Context and Environment | 5.24 | 5.32 | 5.35 | 5.54 |
| Q20. Manage the classroom to support student learning | 5.24 | 5.29 | 5.29 | 5.58 |
| Q21. Use communication strategies to create supportive interactions in the classroom | 5.27 | 5.36 | 5.38 | 5.56 |
| Q22. Facilitate opportunities for students to participate in decision-making | 5.26 | 5.35 | 5.28 | 5.59 |
| Q23. Set up environments that support collaborative student learning | 5.65 | 5.63 | 5.65 | 5.81 |
| Q24. Collaborate with colleagues to support student learning | 5.36 | 5.46 | 5.47 | 5.67 |
| Q25. Actively engage parents in support of their children’s learning | 4.69 | 4.88 | 4.83 | 5.09 |
| Q26. Create learning experiences that make subject matter meaningful to students | 5.58 | 5.63 | 5.66 | 5.77 |
| Q27. Relate disciplinary knowledge of other subject areas outside the classroom | 5.07 | 5.13 | 5.28 | 5.34 |
| Q28. Relate disciplinary knowledge to other contexts outside the classroom | 5.01 | 5.13 | 5.25 | 5.36 |
| Factor 5:Overall satisfaction with preparation | 4.94 | 5.15 | 5.21 | 5.17 |
| Q29. Expectations: To what extent did your experience with the teacher preparation program fulfill your expectations | 4.82 | 5.09 | 5.20 | 5.02 |
| Q30. Overall value: Comparing expense to quality, rate the value of the investment made in your teacher preparation program | 4.60 | 4.87 | 4.89 | 4.91 |
| Q31. Recommendation: To what degree did your teacher preparation program prepare you to succeed as a teacher | 5.12 | 5.29 | 5.36 | 5.35 |
| Q32. Recommendation: To what extent would you recommend your teacher preparation program to a close friend | 5.24 | 5.36 | 5.41 | 5.43 |

EBI Principal Survey Four-Year Aggregate Results

Questions 1-28 are prefaced with the phrase, “Rate the degree to which the teacher demonstrates the skills/abilities to:”

Note: The survey is sent to public school teachers in Washington. Teachers prepared outside the state are not included. The two most recent surveys were completed only by the most recent cohort of program completers (i.e., people who completed their program in the previous academic-year).

| | Cohort | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 |
| Factor 1: Develop Instructional Strategies | 5.25 | 5.48 | 5.41 | 5.45 |
| Q1. Incorporate EALRs (essential academic learning requirements) into instruction | 5.34 | 5.65 | 5.62 | 5.74 |
| Q2. Use assessment information to inform the design of instruction | 5.25 | 5.46 | 5.41 | 5.52 |
| Q3. Use a variety of strategies to reflect on the instruction effectiveness/necessary modifications | 5.44 | 5.65 | 5.64 | 5.63 |
| Q4. Use technology to enhance students’ learning | 4.68 | 5.06 | 4.86 | 4.87 |
| Q5. Use knowledge of subject matter to make curriculum decisions | 5.48 | 5.58 | 5.59 | 5.64 |
| Q6. Articulate learning targets for student learning | 5.37 | 5.57 | 5.49 | 5.51 |
| Q7. Use instructional strategies for developing writing skills | 5.17 | 5.40 | 5.31 | 5.30 |
| Q9. Implement effective instructional strategies related to critical thinking | 5.16 | 5.39 | 5.32 | 5.33 |
| Q10. Implement effective instructional strategies related to problem solving. | 5.26 | 5.47 | 5.41 | 5.46 |
| | | | | |
| Factor 2: Develop Reading Skills Strategies | 4.74 | 5.13 | 4.91 | 5.03 |
| Q8. Use instructional strategies for developing reading skills | 5.17 | 5.47 | 5.39 | 5.43 |
| Q 14. Use current research-based intervention strategies to diagnose reading difficulties | 4.59 | 4.92 | 4.67 | 4.86 |
| Q15. Use current research-based intervention strategies to prevent reading difficulties | 4.43 | 4.92 | 4.55 | 4.76 |
| | | | | |
| Factor 3: Develop Student Learning | 5.25 | 5.45 | 5.38 | 5.44 |
| Q11. Use a variety of instructional strategies to address all levels of academic abilities and talents | 5.32 | 5.50 | 5.42 | 5.46 |

| | Cohort | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2000-01 | 2001-02 | 2002-03 | 2003-04 |
| Q12. Develop developmentally appropriate learning activities that engage students in learning | 5.54 | 5.66 | 5.67 | 5.65 |
| Q13. Develop appropriate learning opportunities for students with disabilities | 5.20 | 5.41 | 5.29 | 5.26 |
| Q16. Develop culturally relevant learning opportunities for all students | 4.99 | 5.34 | 5.29 | 5.33 |
| Q17. Use reflective analysis to assess “positive impact on student learning” | 5.14 | 5.37 | 5.36 | 5.53 |
| Q18. Document “positive impact on learning.” | 5.11 | 5.32 | 5.19 | 5.30 |
| Q19. Use a variety of methods to regularly gather information on student progress | 5.34 | 5.51 | 5.43 | 5.52 |
| Factor 4: Manage Learning Context and Environment | 5.45 | 5.61 | 5.62 | 5.65 |
| Q20. Manage the classroom to support student learning | 5.57 | 5.53 | 5.63 | 5.77 |
| Q21. Use communication strategies to create supportive interactions in the classroom | 5.53 | 5.63 | 5.73 | 5.76 |
| Q22. Facilitate opportunities for students to participate in decision-making | 5.25 | 5.50 | 5.42 | 5.43 |
| Q23. Set up environments that support student learning | 5.54 | 5.74 | 5.72 | 5.78 |
| Q24. Collaborate with colleagues to support student learning | 5.96 | 5.97 | 6.07 | 6.07 |
| Q25. Actively engage parents in support of their children’s learning | 5.20 | 5.47 | 5.36 | 5.35 |
| Q26. Create learning experiences that make subject matter meaningful to students | 5.55 | 5.78 | 5.80 | 5.77 |
| Q27. Relate disciplinary knowledge of other subject areas outside the classroom | 5.14 | 5.40 | 5.35 | 5.35 |
| Q28. Relate disciplinary knowledge to other contexts outside the classroom | 5.16 | 5.45 | 5.46 | 5.45 |
| Factor 5: Overall satisfaction with preparation | 5.43 | 5.66 | 5.62 | 5.44 |
| Q29 Overall evaluation of the teacher’s educational preparation: To what extent does this teacher fulfill your expectations for teaching quality | 5.61 | 5.80 | 5.77 | 5.66 |
| Q30. Overall evaluation of the teacher’s educational preparation: How well prepared was this teacher to take on teaching responsibilities when he/she joined your school | 5.24 | 5.53 | 5.46 | 5.25 |